



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CONSEQUENTS OF THE COMMISSION'S REPORT

BY JOHN C. KIRTLAND
The Phillips Exeter Academy

The editors of the *Journal* have asked me to furnish them with a statement showing the results of the labors of the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin. For the sake of completeness, I shall set down all pertinent facts which could not be included in my article on "The Antecedents of the Commission's Report" in the *Journal* for February, 1910.¹

Lest there survive some misapprehension regarding the failure of the American Philological Association to adopt the commission's report, I wish, first of all, to give the reasons for this, though they may easily be inferred from the report itself and from the minutes of the association's meeting in 1909 as printed in its *Transactions and Proceedings* (Vol. XL, p. xi). The association had sanctioned the organization, under its authority, of a commission, whose members were to be selected from the three Classical Associations; it had empowered this commission to formulate definitions of the Latin Requirements, and to further the adoption of these definitions by the colleges. The commission owed its existence to the Philological Association, but was not a committee of that body; it was distinctly instructed to submit its conclusions directly to those who alone could give them effect. The commission properly held back its report until it could be presented to the association, but asked at that time that no formal action be taken on it, for the reasons given above and because the meeting of the association was thought not to be a suitable place for the discussion of the details of college-entrance requirements. The association voted to continue the commission, and appropriated money for its further expenses. I hope this recital

¹ For explanations and advocacy of the report see the writer's papers "The Report of the Commission" (*Classical Journal* for April, 1910) and "The New Latin Requirements" (*ibid.*, June, 1910).

has made it clear that the Philological Association, while it is not to be held responsible for the particulars of the commission's recommendations, did give the commission the warrant which was necessary to its success, and generous support.

Since the date of its report the commission has met twice, at the time of the meetings of the American Philological Association in 1909 and 1910. On the former occasion the only formal action was the passing of a vote (December 28, 1909) requesting colleges which should adopt the new definitions of the requirements to announce this fact before the beginning of the school year 1910-11, and to hold their first examinations under the new plan in 1911. Shortly after this meeting a proposal to adapt the new definitions to the needs of colleges which require less than four years of Latin for admission was submitted to the members of the commission, and on April 23, 1910, in accordance with a unanimous vote, there was issued a definite statement of two-year and three-year requirements.¹ In December, 1910, the commission had several sessions at Providence, and carefully considered suggestions from various sources. One of these, which had been approved at a conference of the representatives of the Latin departments of New England colleges, called for verbal changes in the two-year and three-year requirements; another, offered by Professor Karl P. Harrington, proposed a uniform certificate; others looked to a grouping of the examinations in two papers and a decrease in the reading of the second year. After mature deliberation it was agreed that stability was desirable at this juncture, rather than betterment, since it seemed likely that any change, however excellent in itself, would produce confusion and imperil the attainment of uniformity. The commission voted, therefore, to dissolve without further action, and so reported to the Philological Association.

The commission's report was received everywhere with a great show of satisfaction. Long, favorable editorials appeared in the *Classical Weekly* of January 22, 1910, the *Springfield Republican* of February 17, 1910, the *School Review* for February, 1910, and the *Classical Journal* for the same month. The *Educational*

¹ See the *Classical Journal* for June, 1910, p. 368.

Review for February, 1910, gave the report less space editorially, but no less vigorous support. The letters from Professor J. W. D. Ingersoll and Mr. Henry Preble printed in the *Classical Weekly* of February 5, 1910, are also noteworthy. So far as I know, the only adverse criticism that has been made in print is contained in Mr. William Cranston Lawton's letter in the *Nation* of August 18, 1910, in which he acknowledges that "there is moderate cause for gratitude" in the other options devised by the commission, but objects to legitimating the reading of Sallust in the schools. I quote a few significant sentences from the editorials and letters mentioned above:

Though the western members of the Commission represented a certificate system of entrance to college and the eastern members one of examinations, it soon became evident that what was really desired was the improvement of the system of teaching in the schools, and in this matter the interests of one section were as vital as those of the other. . . . It seems to me to be a matter of congratulation to the Latin teachers of the country that their representatives have been able to unite upon a set of requirements which represents such a judicious mixture of conservatism and progress.—Professor Lodge, in the *Classical Weekly*.

This is an important forward step, almost comparable to the movement for demanding or at least rewarding a speaking knowledge of French and German. The ability to read Latin at sight has been too much sacrificed to other requirements, and particularly to the requirement of stowing away a stipulated body of Latin books for examination purposes. Many teachers have succeeded by concentrating their work on this one thing, going over the texts carefully and mechanically, with short lessons and frequent reviews, till the average pupil could pass a creditable examination on any of those books, with very little vital knowledge of the language. . . . The chief point to consider is that the student entering college ought to be prepared to study Latin literature and to absorb it in large quantities with pleasure and profit. Generally speaking, Latin literature is more interesting and more valuable to adults than to the young, but facility in reading it commonly must be acquired young or not at all. The worst aspect of the time-honored method is that in later life, when this serious and thoughtful literature would be highly valued, the ability to read it is lacking. It is to be hoped that a notable reform is at hand.—*Springfield Republican*.

The adoption of the plan will of course bring greater relief to eastern schools than to western, since a larger proportion of eastern pupils than of western prepare for the colleges which require examinations. But there are numerous western schools in which, from time to time, one or more pupils

are prepared for these institutions. A great deal of trouble, which might arise at any moment in *any* school, would thus be saved by the general acceptance of the scheme—to say nothing of the fact that the spirit of it seems in itself excellent. It is greatly to be hoped that, when a plan apparently so good has been framed by so representative a body of men for the relief both of the schools and the colleges, the colleges throughout the country will at once prepare to put it to trial, adopting in their catalogues the definitions formulated. In the interests of a general harmony of aims and methods, this hope applies not only to institutions requiring examination, but to those also which admit upon certificate.—*School Review*.

This new report may be unreservedly commended to college faculties everywhere. The weight of the signers alone would make it a document of more than usual importance; but quite apart from the signers the recommendations contained in the report justify themselves by their reasonableness, their good sense, and their thoroughly practical character. We hope that there will be no delay by the leading colleges in following the recommendations of this Commission. Any faculty which declines to follow them takes upon itself a pretty heavy responsibility.—*Educational Review*.

The Commission of course has no *authority* whatever, nor has it, I am sure, any desire to *impose* its views upon anyone. Such influence as it may have must be by way of purely voluntary approval and acceptance on the part of schools and colleges. If such voluntary approval and acceptance are not secured, the Commission will have accomplished little or nothing. Nor will much have been accomplished, if various colleges accept merely certain parts of the definitions of the Commission, making each in its own way certain reservations, exceptions, modifications, or additions.—Professor Ingersoll.

Will you spare me space in *The Classical Weekly* to record my satisfaction in the Report of the Commission on College Entrance Requirements in Latin? It seems to me that the adoption by the colleges of the requirements recommended in this report would be a longer step towards putting Latin study in this country on a solid basis than has hitherto been taken within my remembrance.—Mr. Preble.

A committee of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, which has been engaged since the autumn of 1907 in the consideration of college-entrance requirements,¹ in its second report (1909) had recommended (1) a division of the Latin requirements into two parts (elementary, covering the school work of the first three years, and advanced), with two examinations, preliminary and final; (2) uniform requirements; (3) alternative prescriptions, if the prescriptions were to remain

¹ See the *Classical Journal* for February, 1910, p. 150.

quantitative. Upon the last head the report says: "Such alternative prescriptions encourage variety from year to year in the work of the teachers of the secondary schools, relieve the monotony which deadens their enthusiasms, and extend and broaden their scholarship." Upon the appearance of the commission's report, the committee decided that, so far as Latin was concerned, it could best further the object for which it had been appointed by concurring in the recommendations of the commission. The willingness of the committee to sacrifice, in the interests of uniformity, the considerable results of its own labors in this field was a happy omen. Nor did the committee stop here. It invited the Latin departments of the New England Colleges to a conference, and thereby contributed to the general and unqualified adoption of the new requirements by the colleges of this section. The conference was held in Cambridge, Mass., April 8, 1910. There were present representatives of Amherst, Boston University, Bowdoin, Brown, Dartmouth, Harvard, University of Maine, Mt. Holyoke, Smith, Trinity, Tufts, Wellesley, Wesleyan, Williams, and Yale. It was voted, "That the members of the conference recommend to their respective colleges the adoption as a whole of the report of the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin." In 1910 the committee reported that no colleges had acted adversely on the recommendations.

The College-Entrance Examination Board voted on April 16, 1910, on the recommendation of its Committee of Review, to approve the requirements proposed by the commission, and to set examinations in accordance with the new requirements in June, 1911. It was voted, moreover, that the Board "express the hope that by 1911 a sufficient number of colleges will have adopted the new definition of requirements in Latin to warrant the Board in discontinuing thereafter the examinations based on the old definition."

On March 24, 1911, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools voted unanimously to conform the definitions of the Latin requirements of its Commission on Accredited Schools and Colleges to the recommendations of the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin. The vote was

recommended by the committee that had prepared the old definitions, which thus furnished another conspicuous example of the high-minded generosity that has marked the whole course of the discussion of the commission's report.

The one serious check which the new requirements have met is the attitude of the New York State Education Department. Certificates issued by the department are accepted by a large number of colleges both within and without the state, and the examinations which it conducts are therefore, in some measure, college-entrance examinations. In the "Syllabus for Secondary Schools" for 1910, a document which contains much sound direction for the teacher of Latin, the commission's definitions of the Latin requirements are printed in full, with this comment: "The eminence of the men who composed the commission and the representative positions which they occupy render their report worthy of adoption by all schools at as early a date as may be possible. But owing to the fact that in this State as in all other states there are many schools that can not at once meet the conditions of this report which are ideal, the following syllabus has been prepared substantially in accord with the recommendations of the commission. The object of this syllabus is to develop in the pupil greater power to read and understand Latin by limiting the amount of Latin required for intensive study and by increasing the opportunities for sight reading." What follows, so far as it goes counter to the recommendations of the commission, is this:

Second year. Caesar—*Gallic War*, books i and ii; sight reading equivalent in amount to books iii and iv of the *Gallic War* to be selected from Caesar (*Gallic War* and *Civil War*) and Nepos (*Lives*).

Third year. Cicero—*In Catilinam* i and iii, *De Lege Manilia*, *Pro Archia Poeta*; sight reading equivalent in amount to the second and fourth orations against Catiline to be selected from Cicero (orations, letters, and *De senectute*) and Sallust (*Catiline* and *Jugurthine War*).

Fourth year. Virgil—*Aeneid*, books i, ii, iv, and vi; sight reading equivalent in amount to two books of Virgil to be selected from Virgil (*Bucolics*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*) and Ovid (*Metamorphoses*, *Fasti*, and *Tristia*).

It would be presumptuous for me to criticize the intrinsic merits of the department's instructions to the schools under its guidance, but I may perhaps with decency, in view of the depart-

ment's evident intention to forward the recommendations of the commission, compare promise with performance. The syllabus fixes the same amount of reading as the commission and the same limits of choice, so far as it permits a choice of reading. It will be noticed, however, that it adds to the reading prescribed by the commission's definitions two books of Caesar, two speeches of Cicero, and a book of Vergil, and apparently demands that all the reading not prescribed be done at sight. It thus restricts the freedom of the schools, on the one hand, in the choice of reading; on the other hand, in the determination of the quantity of sight-translation. I suspect that the framers of the syllabus took the definitions of the commission to mean that all reading not prescribed was to be at sight. This explanation would account for their increase of the prescription, and for their statement that "there are many schools that can not at once meet the conditions of this report which are ideal." I can find no other explanation of the statement. The definitions of the commission left the schools free to read the portions of text which the syllabus adds to the prescription. I cannot believe that the schools of New York would generally prefer the department's requirements to those recommended by the commission, and my skepticism has been increased by letters from persons fully acquainted with the situation. It should be remembered that the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, which has a large membership in New York, adopted in 1908, with but a single dissenting vote, resolutions calling for a much smaller amount of prescribed reading than the commission finally agreed upon.¹ I question whether there are many schoolmasters anywhere who are disturbed at the prospect of greater elasticity in college-entrance requirements.

In sending out the report of the commission the secretary asked that he be notified of the action of colleges upon it. To fill in the gaps in this intelligence, I recently addressed to the presidents of certain colleges a request for information that would aid me in preparing this statement. From the answers received by Professor Dennison and myself it appears that the following institutions have formally adopted the new requirements:

¹ See the *Classical Journal* for February, 1910, p. 151.

University of Alabama	Colgate University
University of Arkansas	Columbia College and
University of California	Barnard College
Leland Stanford Junior University	Vassar College
Wesleyan University	Wake Forest College
Yale College and	Fargo College
Sheffield Scientific School	University of Oregon
University of Georgia	Dickinson College
University of Chicago	Pennsylvania College
State University of Iowa	Franklin and Marshall College
Transylvania University	Allegheny College
Bowdoin College	University of Pennsylvania
Bates College	University of Pittsburgh
Goucher College	Lehigh University
Amherst College	Swarthmore College
Boston University	Washington and Jefferson College
Harvard University	Bryn Mawr College
Williams College	Brown University
Smith College	University of South Dakota
Mount Holyoke College	University of Tennessee
Wellesley College	Vanderbilt University
University of Michigan	University of the South
Kalamazoo College	University of Vermont
University of Missouri	Middlebury College
Dartmouth College	University of Virginia
Princeton University	Whitman College
Adelphi College	Lawrence College
Hobart College	Beloit College

The list is not complete. I have only named some representative institutions of different types and different parts of the country. Furthermore, I have omitted a large number of important colleges which were reported as having adopted the new requirements, since it was evident from their catalogues or from facts brought out in the correspondence that they had not fully committed themselves. In some cases, "adopted" clearly meant that the college will accept candidates who have been prepared under the new requirements; in others, the requirements recommended by the commission have been so altered that the adoption cannot be counted a gain for uniformity. Not all, indeed, of the institutions named in the list have fully and unreservedly accepted the commission's recommendations, but I have included only

those of whose favorable attitude I have what seems to be complete assurance. Vassar accepts the new requirements, but will not withdraw the alternative of the present requirements until the new ones "have been generally approved by the schools." Princeton and some other institutions will not entirely withdraw the old requirements until after 1912.

Many colleges print the commission's definitions of the requirements in their catalogues in the exact words of the report, some assimilate the wording to the form used for other subjects. Barnard's announcement gives not only the definitions but also the arguments by which they are sustained in the report—a course calculated to bring out their essential relations to the work of the schools. Yale College accomplishes the same thing in this brief statement: "The requirements stated in detail below are in exact accord with these definitions [those formulated by the commission], of which the principal features are (1) specification of the *amount* of reading required, (2) specification of the *range* within which this reading must be done, (3) stress upon *translation at sight*, and (4) designation of *certain specific texts for careful reading and minute examination*."

Some institutions intentionally enlarge the range of the reading. The University of California, which felt that it could not take a backward step by limiting the choice of the schools, specifies the works recommended by the commission, except the *De senectute*, but indicates a willingness to accept other authors and works for the reading which is not prescribed. Stanford puts the following in place of I, 2, of the definitions: "An equivalent amount of reading from authors other than those specified above may be substituted. The following are suggested: Terence, *Phormio*; Caesar, *Civil War*; Nepos; Cicero, *Letters*; Sallust; Virgil, *Bucolics* and *Georgics*; Ovid, *Metamorphoses*." Boston University recommends Eutropius and Gellius, as well as Caesar and Nepos; does not restrict the choice from Cicero or the reading in poetry; and omits the definite prescription. Middlebury also omits the prescription. The University of Tennessee prescribes no Cicero, but requires at least three speeches, and makes no mention of the letters or the *De senectute*.

It is obvious that the enlargement of the range of reading, though it makes against uniformity, will not embarrass the schools. On the other hand, its confinement within narrower bounds than those set by the commission will make it impossible for schools which prepare for several colleges to feel secure in taking advantage of the freedom promised by the commission's recommendations. In view of the fact that certain institutions explicitly declare that they have adopted the new requirements, while they strictly prescribe all or the greater part of the required reading, it seems likely that the report has been misunderstood. Instead of leaving the schools free to select their reading from the canonical works, the colleges have made the selection. The University of Virginia allows the substitution of an equivalent amount of *Viri Romae* or other Latin prose for one book of Caesar, an equivalent amount of Nepos or other Latin prose for two orations of Cicero (the orations against Catiline seem to be prescribed), and an equivalent amount of Ovid or other epic poetry for the third and fifth books of the *Aeneid*. The commission's definitions are printed in the catalogue of the university, and the requirements are said to be in accordance with them. The University of Missouri allows the substitution of *Viri Romae*, Nepos, or Eutropius for one book of Caesar; of the *Bucolics*, the *Georgics*, or Ovid for two books of the *Aeneid* (no particular books of the *Aeneid* are prescribed). Through a misprint in the *Register* of the university, the requirement in Cicero is not clear. Smith uses the new requirements for candidates entering by examination, the old for those entering on certificates; but equivalents are accepted for the old prescription, and practice in sight-reading is recommended.

With these qualifications regarding the action of particular colleges, the list given above is, I believe, not misleading. It would have been easy to swell the list, as I have already pointed out. The requirements of many colleges show the influence of the commission's report, and I know of none which will not accept in satisfaction of its own requirements a certificate showing that the applicant has passed the "New Requirements" examinations of the College-Entrance Examination Board. These examinations will be set in scrupulous conformity with the recommenda-

tions of the commission. It is possible, therefore, for a school to escape the inconvenience which small variations in the requirements of different colleges cause by offering its students for the Board's examinations. Moreover, the progress of the movement has not stopped. The faculties of several colleges are now considering the commission's report, and the recent action of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools will undoubtedly lead to the adoption of the new definitions by a large number of institutions which frame their requirements in accordance with the recommendations of that association.

The College-Entrance Examination Board will set six "New Requirements" examinations: grammar, elementary prose composition, second-year Latin, Cicero (*Manilian Law* and *Archias*) and sight-translation of prose, Vergil (*Aeneid*, i, ii, and either iv or vi, at the option of the candidate) and sight-translation of poetry, advanced prose composition. The examinations in grammar and elementary prose composition "will presuppose the reading of the required amount of prose, including the prose works prescribed." The examination in second-year Latin "is offered primarily for candidates intending to enter colleges which require only two years of Latin or accept so much as a complete preparatory course. . . . The passages set will be chosen with a view to sight translation. The paper will include easy grammatical questions and some simple composition." Some institutions which require four years of Latin (for instance, Yale and Princeton) will demand that applicants for admission take this examination, or their own similar examination on the work of the second year. Many (including Amherst, Bates, Brown, Dartmouth, Princeton, Wesleyan, Williams) will not demand the advanced prose composition; some that will demand this omit the elementary composition. Barnard will be satisfied with Cicero and sight-translation of prose, Vergil and sight-translation of poetry, and advanced prose composition.

In the paper printed in the *Classical Journal* for April, 1910, I pointed out that the success of the commission's work would not be complete unless its definitions of the requirements were adopted by the colleges which admit on certificates from schools. These

colleges are generally willing to permit substitutes for the reading stated in their requirements, but unless this willingness is proclaimed, it has no effect in opening up new possibilities to the teacher. There is another aspect of the matter, which I can best present in the light of my own experience. In the school in which I am teaching there are every year scores of boys who are intending to enter colleges which accept the school's certificate. These colleges are scattered from Maine to California. The boys may or may not obtain a certificate in Latin, for with us, as with most New England schools, a certificate is granted for only those subjects in which the student has maintained rank higher than a mere pass. They may, therefore, have to take a college-entrance examination. In this way the requirements of any college may, in view of the possible needs of an individual student, claim a share in the determination of our course of study. That the requirements of the commission lend themselves readily to the use of colleges admitting on certificate is proved by the ease with which they have been restated by such colleges. I cite two examples. The full, clear statement in the *Calendar* of the University of Michigan treats separately the content of the school course and the examinations to be taken by those applicants who are not entitled to enter on a diploma, but uses throughout the language of the report. Dartmouth says: "Candidates for admission by certificate must present certificates covering the amount of reading specified in I, 1, selected from the authors and works specified in I, 2; the reading must include the works prescribed in II, 2."

The success of the movement which led to the creation of the commission has far exceeded expectation. The assured agreement of the Latin requirements of the four great universities which admit students only by examination (Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale) is alone enough to justify the agitation. Furthermore, the honest, generous co-operation of all, both within and without the commission, who have been engaged in the solution of the problems that have arisen is an earnest of a better understanding, and has already dispelled some petty suspicions. It must be acknowledged, it is true, that the results are not perfect, even from the standpoint of the commission's practical purpose.

The three Classical Associations and the Philological Association handed on to the commission, with their indorsement, a demand for identical, and not merely uniform, requirements; and the commission petitioned "the authorities of colleges and universities to adopt, without material alteration, the definitions of requirements formulated by it." It has been brought out in the course of this article that deviations from the definitions have been made here and there. These deviations, though they are infrequent, and, for the most part, slight, are not negligible. In the *Journal* for April, 1910, I tried to show that even an improvement of the definitions by individual colleges would not be in the interests of the schools. It is my steadfast conviction that the cause of classical education will be best served by absolutely uniform college-entrance requirements, which yet grant to the schools a large measure of freedom in arranging the details of their course of study.

This is not, in any sense, a report for the commission, and the writer is personally responsible for the facts and opinions here given.